

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 are independent. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 3 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this amendment, claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 have been amended, and new claims 15-19 added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. The amendments of independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 have been made only for clarification, and thus, the claimed scope is not narrowed for any reason relating to patentability. Support for the new claims can be found on, for example, page 11, lines 3-14 of the specification.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiroshi.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Hiroshi discloses a printing system with printing medium selection identically corresponding to what is claimed.

Applicants submit that Hiroshi does not identically disclose a printing system including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, Hiroshi does not disclose, among other things, "creating a preview image, based on said image represented by said print data, and said identification information defined by said information defining element for the paper feed section specified by said paper feed section specifying element," as recited in independent claim 1.

According to the specification, the identification information may be any information which allows an operator to identify paper feed cassettes. A preview image includes the identification information. Displaying the preview image on a display allows the operator to

identify which paper feed cassette is used during a printing operation. It may be preferable to use a visual expression capable of allowing the operator to see the identification information unconsciously. In that sense, it may not be effective enough to display the identification information in a box (region) separately from a preview image to be printed by using the paper feed cassettes identified by that identification information. According to the specification, it may be considered effective to display the identification information as a part of the preview image.

Hiroshi merely discloses displaying sheet data (data about a sheet). The abstract describes, “[t]he form sheet data contains the names and size values of form sheets” and “[a] painter customizer (35) has the functions to push the form sheet data out of the register (33) and visually present it on the monitor screen (25)....” It is apparent that Hiroshi fails to disclose, at a minimum, creating a preview image based on an image of printed data. Accordingly, Hiroshi is silent on “creating a preview image, based on said image represented by said print data, and said identification information defined by said information defining element for the paper feed section specified by said paper feed section specifying element,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, Hiroshi does not identically disclose a painting system including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. The above discussion is applicable to independent claims 7, 9, 11, and 13. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and favorable consideration thereof.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi in view of Shibasaki.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 depend on independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13, respectively. Applicants, thus, incorporate herein the arguments made for responding to the rejection of claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation evidenced by Hiroshi. The Examiner's additional comments and secondary reference to Shibasaki do not cure the deficiencies of Hiroshi.

In addition, there is no motivation to modify the system of the Hiroshi based on the teachings of Shibasaki et al. to arrive at the claimed subject matter. Shibasaki teaches creating a display image based on print data, and performing multi-color printing by combining a draft image for a single color output. However, Shibasaki does not teach, among other things, a plurality of paper feed sections. Therefore, since Shibasaki does not have to identify a paper feed section and does not need to use identification information for that purpose, there is no motivation to combine Hiroshi that displays sheet data with Shibasaki.

Moreover, even if the combination of these references are assumed proper for the sake of this response, the proposed combination does not teach creating a preview image based on the identification information used for creating a preview image and the image representing print data.

With respect to claim 5, the Examiner asserted that Fig. 10 of Shibasaki teaches creating a preview image by using identification information for a pattern of the preview image (the second full paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action).

However, since the symbol "----" in each page shown in Fig. 10 of Shibasaki is a character which originates from the "INPUT DATA FILE 1" shown in Fig. 9. The symbol

corresponds to an image representing print data. Accordingly, the symbol is not a pattern based on the claimed identification information. Further, for example, since figures in respective pages shown in Fig. 10 originate from the "INPUT DATA FILE 2" in Fig. 9. Each figure is, thus, an image representing print data, and is not the claimed identification information. Therefore, claim 5 reciting creating a preview image created by the identification information and the image is distinguishable over Hiroshi and Shibasaki.

Accordingly, Hiroshi and Shibasaki, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of rejection of claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14, and favorable consideration thereof.

New Claims 15-19

Applicants believe that the new claims are patentability distinguishable over Hiroshi and Shibasaki at least because these claims respectively include all the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13. Favorable consideration is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/656,200

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida
Registration No. 60,453

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:TT:lnm
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 18, 2007
WDC99 1477718-1.050099.0237

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**